%JS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
NATASHA CAPEHART			NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
NATAGITA CALETIANI			NCO FINANCIAL STSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendant	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	dress)			
Craig Thor Kimmel, E	squire			D CONDEMNATION CASES, U: NVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
Kimmel & Silverman,	P.C.		Attorneys (If Known)		
30 E. Butler Pike			/ ttorneys (11 tkiown)		
Ambler, PA 19002		_			
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISE	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III CI		DINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
II. DADIS OF JURISL	TCTTON (Place an 'A in One Box Only)		(For Diversity Cases Only)	KINCIFAL FARTIES	and One Box for Defendant)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State O		
☐ 2 U.S. Government	① 4 Diversity	Cítiza	en of Another State (7	2	Principal Place 🗇 5 🗇 5
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			of Business In .	Another State
	•			3 G 3 Foreign Nation	0606
IV MATERIO OF CITE	T m mm a a a a a	Foi	reign Country		
CONTRACT	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	i FC	ORFEITURE/PENAL/TY **	60-107BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
7 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		0 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 120 Marine	🗇 310 Aîrplane 💢 362 Personal Injury	. 0 62	0 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 410 Antitrust
<ul> <li>☐ 130 Miller Act</li> <li>☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument</li> </ul>	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractin Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
150 Recovery of Overpayment			0 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	430 Confinerce
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander 🔲 368 Asbestos Person		O R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 181 Medicare Act ☐ 182 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Injury Product     Liability Liability		0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational	830 Patent 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans	☐ 340 Martine PERSONAL PROPEI	RTY	Safety/Health	D (110 TIMOCHIMIK	490 Cable/Sai TV
(fixel, Veterans)  ☐ 133 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product     370 Other Fraud     Liability     371 Truth in Lending		O Other  LABOR	COLUMN ASSESSMENT OF THE SECOND	☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits	S71 Trum in Lenting     S80 Other Personal		0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY	Exchange
Cl 160 Stockholders' Suits	□ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damag	c	Act	1 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
<ul> <li>☐ 190 Other Contract</li> <li>☐ 195 Contract Product Liability</li> </ul>	Product Liability		0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 D[WC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410  ID 890 Other Statutory Actions
① 196 Franchise	Injury		& Disclosure Act	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO  441 Voting 510 Motions to Vaca		0 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	892 Economic Stabilization Act
17 220 Fareclosure	☐ 442 Employment Sentence		0 Other Labor Litigation 11 Empl. Ret. Inc.	Ø 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	893 Environmental Matters     894 Energy Allocation Act
🗇 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	🗇 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	l"	Security Act	3 871 IRS-Third Party	895 Freedom of Information
1 240 Torts to Land 2 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	236.25	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act  900 Appeal of Fee Determination
D 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & O		2 Naturalization Application	i	Under Equal Access
	Employment		3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee		to Justice  950 Constitutionality of
	Other Other		S Other Immigration		State Statutes
	O 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions	İ	
风   Original	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from		anothe	ferred from   6 Multidist 6 Litigation	Magistrate
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you		ISDCCI	1VI -	' Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices A				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO	N D	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint:
***************************************			<del>//</del>	VORT DEMAND	. 27163 3110
VIII. RELATED CAS	(See instructions): JUDGE		/	DOCKET NUMBER	
Explanation:					
10-22-10					
DATE	SIGNATURE/C	PATTO	RNEY/OF RECORD		
			/		

# Case 2:10-cv-05738-LDD Document 1 Filed 10/28/10 Page 2 of 14

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	e used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of		
Address of Plaintiff: P.O. Box 171, Halifex M. 27	839		
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road, HINST	am, PA 19044		
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	•		
(Use Reverse Side For Ac	dditional Space)		
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation are	d any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?		
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes No No		
Does this ease involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yesa No		
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	/		
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:		
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:			
I. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	or previously terminated action in this court?		
	YesD No.		
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior st action in this court?	ait pending or within one year previously terminated		
action in this court;	Yos□ NoÎD/		
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier to	umbered case pending or within one year previously		
terminated action in this court?	Yes Not		
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?		
	Yes Not		
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)			
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:     □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts		
1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts			
2. © FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury		
3.   Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation		
4. 🗅 Antitrust	4.   Marine Personal Injury		
5. D Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury		
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Plcase		
	specify)		
7. 🗆 Civil Rights	7.   Products Liability		
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus	8. D Products Liability — Asbestos		
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9.   All other Diversity Cases		
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)		
11. XAll other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$1692 (Please specify)			
ARBITRATION CERT	IFICATION		
I Check Appropriate Ca			
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(e)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and			
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	•		
Relief other than monetary damages is soyight.	<b>.</b> .		
DATE: 10-22-10 Crary her Kimmel	<u> 57100</u>		
Artomey-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#		
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	re has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.		
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or except as noted above.	within one year previously terminated action in this court		
10.22	57100		
DATE: 10-20-10 TUIS INV RIMME!	Attorney I.D.#		
CIV. 609 (6/08)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

# CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone	FAX Num	ber	E-Mail Address		
<u>215.540-888</u>		_	Kimme Ocredit	<u>aw.con</u>	1
10-22-10 Date	Fairy Thu		Natusha Capeta Attorney for	gt_	
(f) Standard Manager	nent - Cases that do not	t fall into any on	e of the other tracks.	X	
commonly referred	erse side of this form f	t need special or	intense management by	( )	
(d) Asbestos – Cases i exposure to asbest	involving claims for peros.	sonal injury or p	property damage from	( )	
(c) Arbitration - Case	s required to be designa	ted for arbitratio	on under Local Civil Rule 53.2	2. ( )	
(b) Social Security – C and Human Service	Cases requesting review es denying plaintiff Soc	of a decision of cial Security Ben	the Secretary of Health efits.	( )	
(a) Habeas Corpus – (	Cases brought under 28	U.S.C. § 2241 tl	rough § 2255.		
SELECT ONE OF T	HE FOLLOWING CA	SE MANAGEM	IENT TRACKS:		
plaintiff shall complete filing the complaint an side of this form.) In designation, that defer the plaintiff and all of	e a Case Management T d serve a copy on all def n the event that a defen ndant shall, with its first	rack Designation endants. (See § I dant does not as appearance, sub agement Track E	uction Plan of this court, county form in all civil cases at the 1:03 of the plan set forth on the gree with the plaintiff regard whit to the clerk of court and so designation Form specifying to	time of reverse ing said serve on	
NCO Financial	Systems,Inc.	:	NO.		
Natasha Cap	pehort v.	: :	CIVIL ACTION		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

NATASHA CAPEHART,	<b>)</b>
Plaintiff	}
v.	Case No.:
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS,	INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
Defendant	)
	(Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

#### **COMPLAINT**

NATASHA CAPEHART ("Plaintiff"), by her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

#### INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

- 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the State of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).
- 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Halifax, North Carolina, 27839.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. §

1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy" 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Beginning on or around April 2010 and continuing until August 2010, Defendant, its agents, employees, and servants, engaged in debt collection activities seeking payment from Plaintiff.
- 18. Defendant, its employees and servants harassed Plaintiff by making continuous calls to her cellular phone number.
- 19. Plaintiff received phone calls and voice messages from Defendant on a number of occasions from the following phone number (800)-394-3194. The undersigned has confirmed that the number belongs to the Defendant.
- 20. Defendant placed repeated calls to Plaintiff's cellular phone almost every day. Causing Plaintiff to receive, at times, more than two (2) collection calls a day.
- 21. On several occasions Defendant called Plaintiff informing her that she owed a debt. Defendant would not tell Plaintiff to whom she allegedly owed the debt.

- 22. Defendant called Plaintiff and finally informed her that she owed\$900.00 to Bank of America.
- 23. These constant vague and misleading calls have confused Plaintiff, as material information was never provided.
- 24. On June 22, 2010, Defendant called Plaintiff and demanded payment. Plaintiff informed Defendant that upon Defendant verifying the debt, she would be willing to set up a payment plan beginning in August, 2010, as she is a teacher and her income during the summer months is insufficient to make payments.
- 25. Defendant inquired whether or not Plaintiff had a husband or parents that she could get financial help from. This made Plaintiff feel very uncomfortable as any debt she allegedly owed was of no concern to others.
- 26. Plaintiff became frustrated with Defendant's representative and asked to be transferred to a supervisor; however, the person identified as the "manager" was unwilling to answer Plaintiff's questions.
- 27. The manager elevated the tension by inferring that anything other than an unqualified agreement to pay immediately was unacceptable, telling the Plaintiff that "this is an old bill, so I will contact the needed people", with that the manager hung up the telephone abruptly.
- 28. Plaintiff was concerned how the call ended as it gave her impression that collection efforts would be escalated in an unpleasant and expensive way,

 perhaps including lawyers or the authorities.

- 29. Despite the threats of "contacting the needed people" in the initial April 2010 call, Plaintiff has not received any letters notifying of her legal rights under the law.
- 30. Defendant also failed to provide any documentation detailing the purchases, payments, interest, and late charges, if any, thereby making it impossible for Plaintiff to determine if she owed the alleged debt and/or if it was correctly calculated.
- 31. Upon information and belief, Defendant sought to collect a debt from Plaintiff without any documentation its validity.
- 32. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, and deceptive.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

33. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry,</u> <u>deLaunay & Durand,</u> 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.,</u> 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.,</u> 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson,</u> 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

l

4

5

б

7

10

9

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

25

24

34. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least 35. sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 36. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated § 1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff
     in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
  - c. Defendant violated § 1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
  - d. Defendant violated § 1692e of the FDCPA by using false,
     deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection
     with the collection of a debt;
  - e. The threat to take any action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken;
  - f. Defendant violated § 1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
  - g. Defendant violated § 1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

23 24

25

a debt;

- h. Defendant violated § 1692g of the FDCPA by failing to send written notification, within five (5) days after its initial communication with Plaintiff, advising Plaintiff of her rights to dispute the debt or request verification of the debt;
- i. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, NATASHA CAPEHART, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court. d.

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, NATASHA CAPEHART, demands

a jury trial in this case.

Date: 10-22-10

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C

By:

y:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (215) 540-8817

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com